Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9
Did the Round 1 workgroup meetings (August-September) provide adequate information to prepare you for your involvement in the process?	Yes	Yes	No		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
What critical information (if any) was missing from the R1 workgroup presentations?	It was not made clear how VOCs drive PM air pollution nor was it clear what the sources of VOC are. A pie chart says they are mainly from natural sources and I find this hard to believe considering all our oil refineries, gasoline stations and motor vehicles.		Empirical data supporting VOC role dominating PM2.5 concentrations. Relative contributions by source - and corresponding relative reductions required by source. Amount of reductions needed to attain standard.		It would be useful for the State DAQ to provide a range of control measures for both area and point sources to assist the group in indentifying strategies that are realistic.	1) Concise information sheets showing all PM2.5 and precursor contributors by source. Include amount of each pollutant as well as percentages. 2) Much more thorough discussion of RACT/RACM 3) More comprehensive modeling data. For example, we were only shown the model sensitivity chart for a 25% reduction. What happens to the NOx disbenefit if reduced at greater percentages? 4) What is the 24 hour standard for PM2.5? 5) What strategies is UDAQ currently considering? We shouldn't be re-inventing the wheel.		Specificity on small area sources. Backgournd pm 2.5 levels on graph on p.10 of workbook.	Better understanding of how proposals will be modeled and how benefits outside of PM2.5, such as ozone benefits or economic or energy will be credited.
Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.	Yes	No	Yes		No	Yes	No	Yes	
[Comment] Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.	Yes - i sent Stacee my questions but I never received a response.		Participants were referred to the DAQ website for emission inventory data. Extracting this data requires considerable effort and special OCR software. Clearing Index data has not been updated since 2007 - the episode inventory is 12/09-1/10.			See previous question.		see above	See above.
Have you already developed your constituent group?	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	
[Number of Constituent] How many constituents have you involved?	10	10	10			10	5	4	
[Number of Meetings] How many times have you met with these constituents as a group?	5	1	5				3	1	1
[Informed on PM2.5 issues] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5	3	4			5	4	4	1
[Technical expertise] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	4	3	4			3	4	4	5
[Understanding of process] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	4	3	4			3	4	3	1
[Rank 1] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)			Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest	
[Rank 2] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by media	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest			Informed by media	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	
[Rank 3] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed by media			Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed using DAQ website or publications	

Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9
[Rank 4] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed using DAQ website or publications		Informed using DAQ website or publications				Informed by media	Informed by media	
[Rank 5] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Other							Other	
Do you have any other comments or thoughts about the constituent-based approach being used in this process?	It is important that we understand all the mechanisms of PM2.5 formation.	My constituents felt that the state had not specifically looked into our industry with enough detail to draw the conclusions they had in assigning large percentages of voc's to them as an industry.	Limited timeframe for this effort. Fortunately in our case we had a group already in place to address air quality issues.		Generally, more time is needed for these groups to identify, discuss and find consensus about potential strategies	I think it's critical to the process. There should be more time given for work group members to reach out to their constituents. UDAQ should also be soliciting public input outside of the working group and their constituents.			
[Rank 1] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Point	Mobile	Mobile			Mobile	Area	Area	
[Rank 2] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Mobile	Area				Point	Mobile	Mobile	
[Rank 3] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Area	Point				Area	Point	Point	
Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.	No	Yes	No			No	No	No	Yes
[Comment] Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.									
[Area] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min			0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	60+ min	0 - 30 min
[Mobile] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	30 - 60 min	0 - 30 min	60+ min			0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	60+ min	0 - 30 min
[Point] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	60+ min	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min			0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min
Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.	Yes		Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
[Comment] Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.	I prepared them for the meeting so they were ready with ideas.								
[Rank 1] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Informed by personal or professional interest	Independent research	Informed by personal or professional interest			Independent research	EPA list provided to workgroups	Independent research	Informed by personal or professional interest
[Rank 2] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Independent research	Other	Independent research			Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest	EPA list provided to workgroups
[Rank 3] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?			Informed using DAQ website or publications			EPA list provided to workgroups	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed using DAQ website or publications	
[Rank 4] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?			EPA list provided to workgroups				Independent research	EPA list provided to workgroups	
[Rank 5] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?							Other	Other	

Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9
What was the group's number 1 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Multiple ways to reduce motor vehicle usage.	My group was so concerned with how far off the epa/state emission factors are that spent the whole meeting discussing how to get the epa/state to look at voc numbers from actual graphic art companies.	Improved Vehicle Emission Technology			Design, implement and fund an aggressive vehicle miles traveled and idling reduction plan	Cooling Tower return line VOC monitoring and repair	WE believe that increased efficenncy in existing area sources, specifically homes and small business is our number 1 strategy.	Efficiency retrofits - comprehensive home energy improvement program similar to the Home performance with Energy Star Program. Utah's pilot program cut home energy use in participating homes by 29% and approximately 75% of the savings were natural gas savings. Natural gas combustion is a significant contributor to area source emissions. Further more this program cuts electricity use in the summer months which could reduce the need for power at local natural gas power plants.
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3		5			4	3	5	5
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3		5			4	3	5	5
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3		5			4	4	4	5
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3		5			4	4	4	5
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	5		5			5	1	5	4
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	5		1			2	4	3	4
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 1 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5		5				5	4	5

Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9
What was the group's number 2 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Point source reduction on yellow/red days	See #1	Vehicle Emissin Testing - continue & expand			Implement programs to repower, retrofit and for fleet modernization or equipment replacement for on and off-road heavy duty vehicles, diesel school buses, emergency vehicles, lawn and garden equipment,etc. Adopt requirement for best available retrofit technology (BART) and ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel for these vehicles. This could begin with the State fleet and phase into the private sector through regulation.	Lower LDAR leak definitions to 500/2000 ppm	Reduction in the number of vehicle miles traveled	Keep Utah Current on the adoption of the most recent International Energy Conservation Code for both the Residential and Commercial Sectors. These codes are updated every three years. Utah has adopted the 2009 IECC for commercial construction, but not for residential construction. The current code includes testing which will result in better construction and a minimum of 12% energy savings over the 2006 residential code.
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2		4			3	4	5	5
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4		4			4	3	5	5
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2		4			4	4	5	1
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2		4			3	4	5	4
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	5		3			4	2	4	4
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	5		3			2	3	4	
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 2 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5		4					5	4	5
What was the group's number 3 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Public Education	See #1	Increase Tranist Use - Expand Service			Implement new or improved standards for direct PM2.5 and precursors on all stationary sources	VOC control on tank degassing for maintenance		Improved transit and greater subsidies for transit to encourage greater ridership
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		5			3	3		4

Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		5			4	3		5
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		4			3	4		5
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		5			3	4		4
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3		3			4	2		
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3		2			2	4		
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 3 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5		4				5		5
What was the group's number 4 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Higher taxes on dirtier engines, especially diesels and tax breaks for use of new clean technology.	see #1	Signal Timing Improvements			Implement stringent indirect source review.	Trip reduction plans for major employers		
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2		4			4	3		
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4		5			4	4		
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2		5			4	4		
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3		5			4	4		
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	4		3			4	2		
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3		1			3	3		
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 4 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5		4				5		

Question	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9
What was the group's number 5 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Children walking and biking to school instead of being driven.	see #1	Continue Vanpool subsidy (400 vans); expand by 85 vans by 2014			Provide control strategies for all sources, including small sources, that could collectively advance attainment date.	Slotted guide pole controls on all light liquid storage tanks.		
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		4				4	4	
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		5				4	4	
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2		4				3	4	
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4		5				3	4	
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3		1				4	2	
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3		2				3	3	
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 5 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5		4					3	
What time of day is best to meet?	Either	Morning	Either	Either	Morning	Morning	Either	Morning	Either
Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes
[Comment] Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.							2 hours is better		
Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	No	Yes
[Comment] Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?	As stated previously we need more information on the formation of PM2.5, how it is driven by VOCs and th source of the VOCs.	we are working with the deq	See comments from earlier portions of the survey. Also, Workshop #1 placed too much emphasis on Mobile Sources as the source of the PM2.5 problem and the party responsible to fix it. I will be interested to see what controls are suggested by representatives from point sources and area sources - are they going to look at their own contributions first or will they look to mobile sources to solve the problem.	I enjoyed the first meeting and learning about the issues. However, as a Mayor, I don't feel comfortable meeting with other Mayors in a formal workshop meeting to talk about this. I don't feel I have enough knowledge and they don't have enough time to pull them together. How can I be of value to you on this committee? What do you see my role? Bill	I would suggest that Utah DAQ clarify that these suggested strategies are preliminary and that all participants can provide more suggestions/comments during the public hearing process.				I need a better understanding of modeling and economic modeling

Question	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13	Participant 14	Participant 15	Participant 16
Did the Round 1 workgroup meetings (August-September) provide adequate information to prepare you for your involvement in the process?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	
What critical information (if any) was missing from the R1 workgroup presentations?	DAQ stopped short of sharing their big "hunches" of where control issues would really be required, other than "VOC sources". A little more educated inside information may be more useful in attempting to "cut to the chase" with our constituencies.		Ways to work with groups already established rather than new groups designed by those who attended.	Did not feel process was adequately explained.			
Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.		No	No		No	Yes	
[Comment] Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.	Modling information is good, but information on the validation of the models and their precision/accuracy is still a little vague, despite DAQ's assurances. And has EPA really signed-off on DAQ's approach? We don't want to have to revisit this at a later stage...					More data on small, area sources. What reduction opportunities are there with this group. How to measure	
Have you already developed your constituent group?	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
[Number of Constituent] How many constituents have you involved?	7				3	4	
[Number of Meetings] How many times have you met with these constituents as a group?	1		4	1		2	
[Informed on PM2.5 issues] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	3		5	2	5	4	
[Technical expertise] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	2		5	2	3	1	
[Understanding of process] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	2		4	3	3	2	
[Rank 1] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)		Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed using DAQ website or publications	
[Rank 2] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by personal or professional interest		Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed by personal or professional interest	
[Rank 3] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed using DAQ website or publications		Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	

Question	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13	Participant 14	Participant 15	Participant 16
[Rank 4] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Other		Informed by media		Informed by media	Other	
[Rank 5] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by media				Other	Informed by media	
Do you have any other comments or thoughts about the constituent-based approach being used in this process?	This is a valuable process! It gives me the ability to avoid the posturing game that constituents may wish to play, and to get right to the issues, in an attempt to try and arrive at concessions and solutions.			Primarily used email for communications		Given the stated limited resources of DAQ, what can local authorities such as health departments do? What is their capacity? What is the cost?	
[Rank 1] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Mobile	Mobile	Mobile	Mobile	Mobile	Area	
[Rank 2] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Area	Area	Area	Area	Area	Mobile	
[Rank 3] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Point	Point	Point	Point	Point	Point	
Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.	Yes	No	No		No	Yes	
[Comment] Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.	only as it refers to the nature of PM2.5 emissions and their quantities from these types of sources.					Distinction between area and point	
[Area] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	30 - 60 min		0 - 30 min	30 - 60 min	
[Mobile] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min	60+ min	60+ min	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	
[Point] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min		0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	
Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
[Comment] Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.	Still an active/ongoing discussion... and not one that's easily wrapped up or concluded.					Mostly for mobile sources.	
[Rank 1] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	EPA list provided to workgroups	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Independent research	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest	
[Rank 2] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest	EPA list provided to workgroups	Informed by personal or professional interest	Independent research	Informed using DAQ website or publications	
[Rank 3] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Independent research	EPA list provided to workgroups	Informed by personal or professional interest	EPA list provided to workgroups	EPA list provided to workgroups	EPA list provided to workgroups	
[Rank 4] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Other		Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Independent research	
[Rank 5] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Other	Independent research			Other	Other	

Question	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13	Participant 14	Participant 15	Participant 16
What was the group's number 1 ranked emission reduction strategy?	still tbd	Improved Vehicle Emission Technology	Wasatch Front Regional Councils approach to vehicle emission reduction.	Extend UTA passes to part-time University students and employees. Synergistic benefits include a substantial increase in UTA revenues and concentrated destinations permitting UTA to increase frequency and quality of service which will further increase ridership.	Replacement of diesel buses with CNG buses.	Efficiency practices.	Inspecting Homes at Resale for Energy Efficiency: Home would be inspected at the time of resale for energy efficiency and a report supplied to the seller and the buyer. Where found to be less than minimum standards recommendations would be made as to how they could meet minimum standards. At a minimum the following would be inspected. 1)Windows 2)Insulation 3)Furnace There are already programs in existence that do these kind inspections. The fixes are generally off the shelf. There are programs to supply financial assistance low income residents. The cost savings for most repairs would show a pay back in a few years in most cases.
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		5	3	5	5	2	3
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		5	4	5	5	5	4
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		5	3	5	5	4	2
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		5	3	4	5	2	2
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		5	5	5	4	4	2
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		1	3	2	4	3	5
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 1 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		5	4	5	5	4	

Question	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13	Participant 14	Participant 15	Participant 16
What was the group's number 2 ranked emission reduction strategy?		Continue and Expnad Vehicle Emission Testing	public information and community involvement	Downtown businesses/offices provide annual UTA passes to employees. May replace free parking. Synergistic benefits include a substantial increase in UTA revenues and concentrated destinations permitting UTA to increase frequency and quality of service which will further increase ridership.	Solar panels on bus shelters.	BACT	Inspection of Small Area Sources to Encourage the Use of Best Practices: Small sources such as auto paint businesses, dry cleaners etc would be inspected to ensure that they were using industry accepted best practices.
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	4	4	4	2	3
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	4	5	5	5	4
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	3	5	5	3	3
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	3	4	5	1	3
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		3	3	5	4	4	2
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		3	3	2	4	4	5
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 2 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		5	3	5	5	3	
What was the group's number 3 ranked emission reduction strategy?		Increase Transit Redership with Expanded Service	Clear the air, reduce idling of cars.	Increase transit frequency on commuter corridors. Facilitated by previous emission reduction strategies 1 & 2.	Anti-Idling Program for UTA buses.		Inform and Motivate Drivers to Reduce VMT: Information would be supplied to motorists to let them know the amount of pollution their vehicle was emitting and informing them of ways to cut down on their driving. One of the key places to supply this information is at the time of the vehicles annual or biennial vehicle emissions inspection
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		5	4	3	5		5

Question	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13	Participant 14	Participant 15	Participant 16
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		5	4	3	5		5
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	3	3	5		5
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		5	2	3	5		5
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		3		5	3		3
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		1		1	3		5
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 3 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		4		5	5		
What was the group's number 4 ranked emission reduction strategy?		Expand UDOT Signal Timing Efforts by 150 Additional signals annually		Improve Bike/ped paths/access to transit.	Wind Turbines on buildings and bus shelters.		
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4		3	2		
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		5		5	3		
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		5		3	2		
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		5		3	5		
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		3		4	2		
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		1		2	2		
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 4 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		4		5	3		

Question	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13	Participant 14	Participant 15	Participant 16
What was the group's number 5 ranked emission reduction strategy?		Continue Vanpool efforts (400+ vans); Add 85 vanpools to UTA Rideshare by 2014		Improve streets -- Complete Streets	Geothermal heat pumps.		
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4		2	2		
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		5		4	3		
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4		2	2		
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		5		2	5		
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		1		4	2		
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)		1		1	2		
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 5 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		4		5	3		
What time of day is best to meet?		Morning	Morning	Morning	Morning	Morning	
Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.		Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	
[Comment] Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.				Two hours		2 hours	
Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?		No	No	Yes	No	Yes	
[Comment] Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?				Confusion over rating of "end user impact." Others may have been confused over meaning of this rating as well.		Some of the group member are questioning the relationship between the State and the largest point sources. Along with that there is a questioning of the monitoring data. Please work to diffuse. Demonstrate the validity of the data. Be obviously candid about the relationship between the state, the legislature and the affected large point sources.	